

# The Lord's Supper.



BX  
5949  
.C5  
M35  
1887

All glory be to Thee, O Lord.

4.1.01.

**PRESENTED TO THE LIBRARY**  
**OF**  
**PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

**BY**  
**Professor Henry van Dyke, D.D., LL.D.**

BX 5949 .C5 M35 1887  
Mallory, George Scovill,  
1838-1897.

Lord's Supper: the continued  
feast on the one completed







Rev. Dr. Van Dyke  
with the author's  
highest regard.



THE LORD'S SUPPER:  
THE  
CONTINUED FEAST  
ON  
THE ONE  
COMPLETED SACRIFICE.

✓  
BY GEORGE S. MALLORY, D.D.

NEW YORK:  
E. P. DUTTON & Co., 31 WEST 23D STREET.





THE LORD'S SUPPER:  
THE CONTINUED FEAST ON THE  
ONE COMPLETED SACRIFICE.

---

AN examination of our Lord's Words at the institution of His Supper, in the hope of finding out their exact meaning and the true nature of that greatest act of Christian worship, led gradually and irresistibly to the theory which the writer confesses not to have held before, that in the Lord's Supper, our Lord handed down as the chief worship of His Church, a sacrificial feast—the feast on His own sacrificed Body. It was not simply *a* feast, it was *the* feast, the feast which pertained to, belonged to, was the necessary corollary of, our Lord's sacrifice on the cross. Its individuality, its definiteness as the particular feast which necessarily followed

the sacrifice of our Lord's Body, appears in St. Paul's solicitation, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore, let us keep the feast." It does not appear, for instance, it has been lost sight of, in the invitation in the communion office of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., "Christe our Pascal Lambe is offered up for us once for all, when He bare our sinnes on His Body upon the crosse, for He is the very Lambe of God that taketh away the sinnes of the worlde; wherefore let us kepe a joyfull and holy feast with the Lorde."

That the crucifying of our Lord was a sacrifice all men must admit. It was not, indeed, done in accordance with the ritual of God's Church, nor was it the official act of the priests, though one of Christ's own disciples conspired with the chief priests to bring it to accomplishment. It was not a sacrifice that could be made by God's priests, for the victim was a human being—nay, was the God-man. The death must needs be, but the doing it was an offence, and woe to those by whom the offence should

come. The trial, the judgment, and the death, were the processes of a mistaken observance of human laws, and Roman soldiers compassed the death of the Victim. Yet all Holy Scripture points to the death of our Lord as a sacrifice. Jesus Christ offered Himself, offered His life for the sins of the whole world, and His life was taken. As often occurs in the world's history, the wickedness and weakness of men were made to be the instruments for carrying out God's plans. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts ii. 23.). The sacrifice was made. The making, the performing of the sacrifice, so far as the crucifixion is concerned, was the work of the Roman soldiers—the offering of Himself for the sacrifice was Christ's own propitiatory offering.

Our Lord's body, then, was sacrificed, was made a sacrifice, and the feast upon that sacrifice, its particular sacrificial feast, was enjoined, or, rather, provided for by Him. In doing this

He introduced no new idea of worship, established no new principle. Sacrificial feasts were, at that time, practised all the world over, and their meaning and scope were perfectly familiar to all, of whatever religion. They had been established by God in His earliest commands regarding the worship to be addressed to Him, and heathen nations had borrowed them from His chosen people. Their establishment was the embodiment of a principle divinely ordained. The principles of God's dealing with men never change. Therefore Christ, being God, did not, and we may say could not, dishonor, or disregard this establishment of the sacrificial feast. We may rightly reason that such a disregarding would not have been in accord with that attribute of God which we discover by the unchangeableness of His workings. One might safely have argued in advance, from the nature of God, that the principle which He laid down in establishing the Passover, long before the giving of the Ten Commandments, would probably be observed by the Son. In-

•

deed, that Christ *is* our Passover necessarily involves the duty or the privilege that we should keep *the* feast. To say that Christ is "our Passover" is to say that He is "our Paschal Lamb of which we are to partake."

The sacrificial feast was the means by which those who partook of it were joined with the offerer in making his offering, and so became sharers with him in all the blessings to be gained by the offering. Therefore in commanding to eat and to drink the broken bread and the wine poured out as His body broken and His shed blood, our Lord made it possible for His disciples always and everywhere to be joined with Him in offering Himself for His all-sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, and so to share in all the blessings gained by that sacrifice. In other words, His disciples are to partake of Christ dead, *i.e.*, sacrificed, in order that they may be joined with the living Christ in offering Himself for that sacrifice. Christ is the true Paschal Lamb. As in the Passover the head of the family offered the



paschal lamb for sacrifice—provided the paschal lamb—and called upon the members of the family to eat of it when sacrificed, so Christ offering Himself for sacrifice, providing the true Paschal Lamb, calls upon the whole human family, of which He is the Head, to partake of the sacrifice. By this partaking His great act becomes ours, in effect, through His blessed invitation, and the benefits of the sacrifice of the true Paschal Lamb which He thus provided are made ours. The contemplation of this great privilege of such a unity with our Elder Brother, thus calling upon all the household to partake of the slain Lamb, and of the unity of all His disciples through all time and everywhere joining in this same one continued sacrificial Feast, and the new clearness that it gives to many parts of the Old and New Testaments have been so great a source of satisfaction to the writer, that he publishes this essay, in the hope that it may help to lift others above the clouds of discordant teaching into the clear light of Christ's own words.

We are celebrating the Festival of the Nativity. The blessed revelation of the Incarnation is before us. The Son of God is become the Son of Man. He has taken humanity to Himself, and henceforth Deity and humanity are ever joined together. The atonement is begun. The God-man is become the head of the human race. He is the second Adam. As in the first Adam all died, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. As in Adam all sinned, even so in Christ shall all gain redemption from that sin. Humanity shared in the deed of Adam; so also it is to have part in Christ's work. He is become the representative of humanity. He has gathered humanity into Himself. The embodiment of humanity is now the perfect man—Christ Jesus. Not that we loved God, but because He first loved us—of God's own will and favor—humanity is hereafter united with Deity in working out its own redemption and salvation. Humanity, not of its own power, but by the Grace of God, humanity in the person of the man Christ Jesus, is to

overcome the evil wrought by the first man. But while this season of the Christian year brings the Incarnation more immediately before our minds, we cannot but remember that in fact the Saviour's redemptive work on earth is finished. He has returned into the heaven to prepare a place for us. He has resumed the glory of which He emptied Himself that He might take upon Him our nature. In great triumph He has entered again into the joy of His Father's presence. At the right hand of the Father He now sitteth, and ever maketh intercession for us, thus continuing there the work begun in the redemption. On the earth His Vicar, the Holy Spirit, is come and is now present in the Church, sent by the Son to bestow upon its members the inestimable gifts which He gained for them by His meritorious Cross and Passion. In the immediate contemplation then of the Incarnation, and also with the eyes fixed on our Lord at the right hand of the Father, and the Holy Spirit upon earth striving with and for man, that all mankind should be partakers of Christ's Resurrection, this essay is begun.

In entering upon an inquiry into the nature of the Lord's Supper, resort must be had at once to the words of our Lord in which He instituted and by which He explained it. For two propositions may be laid down axiomatically as bases of our belief:

First, we must accept, and we do accept, reverently and gladly, whatever statement our Lord thus made to His disciples, and we assert the same to be true;

Secondly, we must not assert, and we cannot believe, anything whatever regarding the nature of the Lord's Supper contrary to or differing from what our Lord Himself declared.

Our Lord said, "Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you." Therefore we accept this statement. He did not say, "this is not My body," nor "in this is My body," nor "under this is My body," nor "this bread is a form or veil under which My body is present," nor "with this is My body," nor "I am in this bread," nor "this is changed into My body," nor "this becomes My body," nor "under each

atom of this bread is whole Christ," nor "this bread ceases to be." Any of these statements could, of course, have been made by our Lord, if they had been true. But the statement which He did make is not in the least synonymous with them, is entirely different from them. Therefore we are not to make or believe those statements.

Our Saviour's words were the expression of His will. If man reads into them any meaning of His own, they become so far the expression, not of Christ's will, but of man's. They were the expression of the Saviour's will, on whose will alone their value or efficacy depends, and by whose will alone they became true. They express, therefore, Christ's truth, and man must neither add to nor subtract from that truth.

As they are, then, such a complete expression of our Lord's will, it is our duty as loving disciples, to seek to know that will thus expressed. They are a gracious declaration of our Lord, and therefore of inestimable value. With lov-



ing care we should seek diligently to find their exact meaning.

That we can thus know the exact and full meaning of our Lord's *words* there is no doubt, for they are words of human language, and their meaning is determined by the rules of human language. As the wine into which the water had been miraculously changed, would have responded perfectly to whatever test man could have applied to it, whether as to taste or as to color, or, by a chemical analysis, as to its component parts, so the words of our Lord, which like the wine are the outcome and expression of His will, may be tested reverently, perfectly, by the rules of language.

He chose to express His will in words and He chose these words in which to express His will, and therefore they are the perfect expression of His will. They are words standing in certain relation to each other, and all, together, containing and giving a meaning which is perfectly and absolutely determined by the rules of language and the usage of man's speech.

The entire sentence conveys its meaning as clearly and distinctly as any single word conveys its own meaning. It is as impious to suppose or to teach that Christ meant something which He did not say as that He said something which He did not mean. In short, the divine thought found perfect expression in man's language, and being thus expressed, the rules of man's language determine what that thought is.

We cannot suppose that Christ did not express Himself perfectly, for that would be to suppose His own imperfection. We need not assert that the whole of the divine wisdom, which is infinite, can be expressed in man's language which is finite, or conveyed to man's *mind* which is finite. But we must believe that what God chooses to express to man, He can, and, by the necessity of His nature, *must* express accurately and adequately. Man must not, therefore, presume to substitute any phrase of his own for that chosen by Christ.

“ The Lord Jesus, the night in which He was

betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake, and said, 'Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken\* for you; this do in remembrance of Me.' After the same manner also the cup, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in My blood;† this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.' For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." (I. Cor. xi. 23-26.)

It is to be noted here, and it should always be kept in mind that drinking the cup has equal place with eating the bread, in this injunction of our Lord. For our present purpose, however, it is sufficient to consider now only that sentence which refers to the bread.

Having in mind the circumstances narrated in the context we find that as it was bread

\*In the version of the late Revision Committee, and by Westcott & Hort this word "broken" is omitted, but on the whole there seems to be good reason for retaining it.

† "This is My blood of the new testament which is shed for you" (St. Matthew and St. Mark).

which Jesus took, so also it was bread which He brake, and which He gave to the disciples. Examining the sentence itself strictly by the rules of language, we find that the pronoun "this," also, plainly and necessarily refers to the bread which He was thus distributing, being used without the noun, because the action sufficiently directed the attention of the hearers. It is true, of course, that in the inspired record "this" is in the neuter gender, while the Greek word for "bread" is masculine. But it is impossible to base any doctrine on the difference in gender, as implying that "this" does not refer to, stand for, and mean, bread. The rules of the Greek language required that "this" referring to a masculine noun should be neuter in this sentence by attraction to the Greek word for "body," which is neuter.

It is also certain that the words "My body" referred to His own, His one, His only body, which was once born into the world, which was to be crucified, to be buried, to rise again in a glorified state and to be taken up into heaven,

where it is now seated at the right hand of the Father.

We note also that our Lord speaks of His body *in only one aspect, or in one condition*, at one point of time, as crucified, *sacrificed*, "broken for you." He did *not* say "This is My body which is *glorified*."

These words ("this," meaning bread, and "My body which is broken for you") are joined together, associated, by the word "is."

The verb "to be" is a marked verb in every language. It is the most commonly used, and yet the most useless of verbs. In some of the most ancient languages, as for instance, the Aramaic, or ancient Syriac, spoken by our Saviour, "is" was always omitted. It is quite certain,\* for instance, that He did not say "Take, eat; this is My body," but "take, eat, this My body." It is probable that He said,

---

\*The Peshito Syriac New Testament was probably translated in the first or second century from the Greek. In such a translation it would have been natural to bring in "is" which is found in the Greek. But in a copy of the ancient Syriac version, which is now lying before the writer, "is" is not



“I the vine, ye the branches.” The meaning of this is perfectly clear, quite as clear as if He said, “I am the vine, ye are the branches.” The higher polish of the Greek language required the use of the verb “is” where the Aramaic did not use it, but the meaning of the inspired record is exactly the same with the original utterance. “This is My body” in the Greek, is identical with “This My body” in the Aramaic.

In Arabic, again, the verb is found, but there is no form of it for the third person of the present tense; there is no “is” in Arabic.

“Is” is called the substantive verb because it betokens existence. Added to a noun it directs one’s thought regarding the noun to the mere existence of the thing, animate or inanimate, which the noun denotes. “The man is” leaves out of present view all considerations regarding him, except his existence.

---

found in the records of St. Matthew, and St. Luke, and St. Paul, and does appear in St. Mark. This copy of the Peshito version is only seven hundred years old, which shows how slow the Aramaic language was in adopting the use of the present tense of the verb “to be.”

"Is" is in all languages an "intransitive" verb, that is to say, it does not govern any "objective case." Intransitive verbs are so called because the action expressed by them does not "pass over" to, does not affect the objective. The verb "to be" is an intransitive of intransitives, because it does not express any action, or even feeling, but simply the barest, baldest existence, the mere individuality of the subject, of that of which it is affirmed. So complete is this intransitiveness of the verb "to be" that grammarians ordinarily style it a copula. By this they mean that it serves merely to connect two nouns for the purpose of affirming one of the other.\*

---

\* It is better to treat "is" entirely as an intransitive verb, and to apply to it the rules which govern verbs of that class. When an intransitive verb, having a noun for its subject, is followed by a noun, this noun is called in grammar a predicate. This noun, following the intransitive verb, is predicated, affirmed, of the subject of the verb, especially in respect to the action or condition expressed by the verb.

Take for examination the sentence, "She walks a queen." The word "queen" is predicated, or affirmed, of "she" in the action of walking. Again, we say, "She is a queen." In

The effect of the intransitive verb is temporarily to strip the subject of its other qualities, in order to give distinctness, definiteness to the affirmation in the noun predicate.

The noun which follows the verb is a distinct affirmation or predication concerning the subject. This predication or affirmation by means

this case the verb expresses, not a special action, but a general, continued, and necessary state, which is so completely identified with the noun as to present no distinguishable or separable idea. It is "she" in her very being, in her existence, it is she herself of which "queen" is affirmed.

It will be of service in getting a clear conception of the office of the verb "to be," to substitute for it the verb "exist." "She is a queen" is equivalent to "She exists a queen." "This is My body" is the same as "This exists My body." "Is" and "exists" are interchangeable words. Milton writes:

"By whom we exist and cease to be."

Here plainly only the requirements of verse determined whether he should write "exist" or "are," "be" or "exist." Whatever, therefore, can be said of "She exists a queen," can be said of "She is a queen." They have absolutely the same meaning. She is, she exists, and of this is affirmed the idea of "a queen." Of each alike of these expressions, "she walks, she is, she exists, a queen," it may be said that the action or state expressed by the verb refers only to its subject, not passing over to or affecting the noun predicate, and that noun is another and independent affirmation.

of intransitive verbs in cases where the nouns are *not* names of *different* things, is sometimes absolute and sometimes partial; and this is always determined by the circumstances. *She walks a queen, she is a queen*, may be spoken of either Queen Victoria or of any untitled lady. Of Queen Victoria the predication is unlimited; of the untitled lady it is affirmed either that she walks with that grace and dignity which rightly pertain to a queen, or that she, in her *being*, in herself, has those qualities, those graces of heart and mind which are or should be the characteristics of a queen. In cases where the nouns *are* names of different things the predication is invariably partial. In the expression *His creditor is adamant*, because *creditor* and *adamant* are two distinct material existences, the predication is *necessarily limited to a quality*, to the hard and unyielding quality of the adamant. In our Lord's saying, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," He plainly did not attribute the wood or any of the substance of the vine to Himself and His disciples. It

was the single *quality*, or circumstance, of the closeness of the relationship between them, of their vital dependence upon Him. So also it was this same quality which St. Paul attributed to the Ephesians when he wrote, "Ye are the body of Christ," or, again to all Christians when he wrote, "the Church which is His body." When we say of a piece of paper, *This is a dollar*, we predicate the dollar, not as to the intrinsic substance of the gold, but only as to the purchasing quality, as to the power, or virtue, or efficacy in commercial transactions. The gold or silver of which the dollar is made, became a dollar by coinage. As a coin, it had the added quality of being a means of exchange in commercial transactions. This added quality the Government bestowed also upon the almost worthless paper.

To say, therefore, of the paper, *This is a dollar*, is to predicate of it this added quality, to affirm that it shares with the dollar not the substance or the intrinsic qualities of the gold dollar but the quality of a certain value in buying



and selling, that the paper and the dollar have an equal power, the same efficacy, though they are two different and distinct things. From this it results that predicating the value or power in one thing, of some other thing, makes the one thing a representative of the other. The verb "is" means always the same thing, namely, "being," but the idea of "represents," or "stands for," etc., is the *result* of the partial predication, the predication of this or that quality.\*

There are certain unalterable rules which

---

\* When one *material* thing is predicated of another thing, only its *qualities* are thus predicated and almost or quite invariably it is only one quality. The *substance* of a material thing is never predicated of another thing. Thus, curiously enough, Romanists place themselves in utter opposition to the absolute meaning of language in expressions of the class adopted by our Lord,—“This is My body,”—when they assert that He predicated the substance of His body, of the bread: that while its form, taste and appearance remain in all respects the same, its substance is that of the body of Christ. A change of substance is never expressed or intimated by such forms of speech. *They always, invariably, declare a sameness of some quality and that only* between the two material things. This quality may be an inherent quality, as the hardness of the adamant, or an extraneous, conventional, added quality, as the purchasing power of the dollar.

are tacitly made the basis of the use of these predicative expressions. In what respect or degree one noun is predicated of another, what quality of one noun is predicated of another, is determined not by the predicated sentence, but by some circumstance or statement outside or beyond it. As we have seen, a title, or office, for instance, though it is not a material thing and has no material substance, can be predicated not absolutely, but only as to certain qualities, or in certain respects, of one who does not hold that office or title. Still more impossible is it that one material thing can be absolutely, completely, altogether, predicated of another thing. For that would be to declare that there is no respect in which they differ—to declare their physical identity, and the fact of their being two things prevents their being one and the same thing.\* They must, for instance,

---

\* This impossibility of two things being one and the same thing leads Roman theologians into a singular illogicalness. We will quote from Muller's "Familiar Explanation of Christian Doctrine," a book having the approbation of the Sacred

in order to be cognized by us, in order to exist, occupy each its own space and not the space held by the other, and this is absolute proof of

---

Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and the *imprimatur* of Dr. Bayley, late Archbishop of Baltimore.

“Q. How do you know that Jesus Christ gave His true body?

“A. Because Jesus Christ did not say *in* this bread, or *with* this bread—but He said, ‘This is My body.’

“Q. As soon as Jesus had spoken those words what became of the bread in His hands?

“A. Quicker than a flash of lightning that bread was changed into His body.

“Q. What follows from this?

“A. That, after these words, the bread did not remain, because it is impossible that that which is flesh should be at the same time bread.”

The Roman doctor has well stated that our Lord said, “This is my body,” and that He did not say *in* this bread or *with* this bread; but He should have added that He did not say *under* this bread, or this bread is *changed into* or *becomes* My body, or this bread *does not remain*.

The Roman doctor, too, is thoroughly illogical in saying that because, as he claims, the bread was changed into Christ's body, therefore the bread did not remain. Plainly the bread must have continued to be, if it was to be anything whatever. *If it were true* that the bread *became* Christ's body, that which was His body previously must have ceased *to be*, or at least must have ceased to have the quality of being His body, must have ceased *to be His body*.

their not being physically identical. This alone shows that they are not wholly the same, but the same in some respect. To declare that two

---

And again, the Roman theologian ought to know that he must not be driven by one impossibility into inventing another. He acknowledges that it is impossible for one thing to be at the same time another thing, but he does not cure the difficulty by saying that the one thing becomes another thing. For that also is an impossibility. The Romanist is fond, for example, of quoting the miracle of the water turned into wine. But that was not the changing of one thing into another thing. It was not, for instance, the placing of two firkins, one of water and one of wine, side by side, and changing the firkin of water into the firkin of wine. The miracle was the changing of the nature of one and the same thing—of the same water in the same firkin. It was not the changing of one thing into another, but simply the changing of one thing.

When the Romanist, or theologian of any other school, argues for a miracle underlying our Lord's declaration, from the miracle of the water changed into wine, he is reasoning from analogy. But the miracle at Cana and the alleged miracle of transubstantiation are not analogous. If they were analogous the miracle at Cana must have been performed thus: Two firkins, one of water and one of wine, must have been set before our Lord, the firkin of water corresponding to the bread, and the firkin of wine to Christ's body. Then the one firkin (of water) must have been changed into the other firkin (of wine). This is not what St. John recorded and is inconceivable, not supposable (if it were possible, it would require the displacement, the destruction, of the firkin of wine). Analogy further

things are one, or that different things are the same, or that one thing is identically another, which is only one form of saying that two things are one and the same thing, is to declare that words have no meaning. To predicate one thing of another, therefore, is not to predicate it *altogether*, not to declare its identity, its sameness with the other, but to declare the sameness of some one or more of their qualities or their sameness *in some respect*. What or wherein or for what purpose that partial *sameness* is, does not usually appear from the predicated sentence.\*

---

requires that the firkin of water, being changed into the firkin of wine, should still retain its separate, independent existence, apart from the other, and moreover, that the taste and the color and all the other qualities of the water should remain the same as before, still unmistakably water. Verily this would be a barren miracle! God be praised that the miracle at Cana was a miracle indeed!

The Romanist ought to recognize that it is impossible to change one thing into another already existing, and still more inconceivable is it to effect such a change that the same thing may have two or more separate existences at the same time.

\* An essential part of the identity of anything is its history. One human body for instance differs from another human body

In the declaration of our Lord, "This is My body," the words "My body" are predicated of "this," which is a pronoun standing for the noun "bread."\* In what respect, how far, as

---

in respect to the fact of its birth, and this difference can never be done away with. Completed history cannot be changed. Our Lord's body was born of the Virgin Mary, but the bread was not born of Mary and that quality could never be imparted to the bread. When our Lord from the cross said to His mother, "Behold thy Son" and to the beloved disciple, "Behold thy mother," He declared that St. John was the son of Mary, but He did not declare that he was born of her nor did He make it so. He simply attributed to or bestowed upon St. John a single quality of sonship to Mary, namely, the relation and duty of dependence and protection that arise from sonship. Nor did this mislead the beloved disciple. Strong and unreserved as the expression was, St. John yet understood it, "and from that hour that disciple took her to his own home." So as to the bread, our Lord asserted it to be His body, but in so doing He did not assert that it had all the qualities and substance of His body.

The analogy between our Lord's sayings, This is My body, and, Behold thy son, is much more complete than is commonly supposed. He attributed in the one case a certain quality of His body to the bread. In the other case He attributed a quality of His soul and heart to St. John. The expressions are equally unreserved and explicit, but their limitations are equally apparent.

\* It does not matter, so far as our inquiry is concerned, whether "this" referred to the bread, or, as the Romanist

to what quality, or purpose, or use, does He thus predicate it? That is to say, inasmuch as, occupying each its own space and so being different things, they are not the same things, and therefore the predication cannot be absolute, complete, in how far is the predication made? What attribute, or quality, or use, of His body does our Lord attribute to the bread? What of His own body does our Lord lend to, or bestow upon the bread? There is a sameness in some respect, of the bread with Christ's body. As to what the partial sameness is, the words themselves convey no intimation. If our Lord had said or done nothing further than to utter the words, "This is My body," the disciples would have had no clue as to His meaning.

Hence it appears that theological writers have commonly done great despite to our Lord, by garbling His saying, in separating the words, "This is My body," from the remainder of His

---

says, to a something into which the bread had been changed. In either case it had a distinct, distinguishable existence.

declaration and considering them by themselves.\*

It is the first principle of exegesis that a passage of Holy Scripture shall be considered in connection with the context. It is a most flagrant violation of this principle to take from the middle of a sentence, of a single statement, three or four words only and on them to build human doctrine. It is against all honesty to quote certain words of a man's saying, without also giving his qualifying words. It is, there-

---

\* In this flagrant mutilation of our Lord's declaration, is found the true explanation of the strange fact that what our Lord intended, as is evident from His prayer made in the same hour, to be a very bond of unity among all Christians, has been an unceasing cause of strife and division. This state of things has seemed to be a reproach not only to Christianity, but to its Founder as well. It has seemed as if He must have ill chosen His language to be so misunderstood, or to be understood so variously, or as if He had purposely made His meaning ambiguous, like the Delphic oracle, which uttered disconnected words, that were afterward put together, or interpreted, by the priests to suit their own purposes. The real fault lies in this, that Christ's words, clear and distinct as He uttered them, have been disconnected, we will not say by his priests, but by theological writers, and being thus made lifeless and unmeaning, have been interpreted by each, or by each



fore, against the fundamental principle of exegesis, and against common honesty to quote the words, "This is My body," apart, separated from the remainder of the sentence.

It is a curious fact that the cutting out of the words, "This is My body," from the rest of the sentence in which they occur, and by which our Saviour gave them meaning and explained them, has made them so perfectly unmeaning, has so emptied them of meaning, that men have found it possible to put into them any and every meaning.

---

school, to suit their emergency. Hence has come the fact that the vast body of theological writing on this simple and sublime saying of our Lord, is a mass of controversy.

It is a grave accusation, but it needs no proof here that all this theology is based positively or negatively, on the words "This is My body" taken by themselves, torn from their context, nay, even from the remainder of their own sentence. Rome and Geneva alike have been guilty in this respect.

It follows, of course, that every theory *which has no other basis* than this grave error, must itself be erroneous.

For the confirmation of our faith let us repeat to ourselves here that our Lord made no uncertain or ambiguous utterance, but that the ambiguity and uncertainty which have been thrown around the Lord's Supper, have been manufactured by men, even devout men, out of a mutilation of our Lord's saying.

Others again, forgetful or unknowing that the context supplied the meaning, and being unable to find definite meaning in the words thus wrongly, impiously taken by themselves, have concluded that the Saviour meant to conceal His meaning in them, and so have resigned themselves to a darkened, uncertain, undiscerning, unreal, and unhelpful worship in the Lord's Supper.

Plainly our Lord did not attribute the personal appearance, the figure and face of His body to the bread. He had not moulded the bread into such form that He could attribute to it a likeness of Himself, as the sculptor can say of his clay or marble, "This is Cæsar." He did not say that it had flesh and bones and the power of suffering, as His body had. He did not say that it was to stand in judgment, to be buffeted, to be scourged, to be crucified, nor did these things come to it. It had not hands and feet to be pierced by the cruel nails, nor a forehead to wear the crown of thorns. His body was to be buried, to be raised again, to be glori-

fied, to be taken into heaven, but it was not so with the bread. In none of these respects did Christ predicate His body of the bread. That is to say, the bread was not His body in any of these respects.

What then? For what purpose was the bread our Lord's body? He Himself declared this, He gave definiteness and the necessary limitation, when He said, "Take, eat." It was in respect to being eaten that our Lord's body, sacrificed, "broken for you," was predicated of the bread.

This is quite as far as the *words* of our Lord, carefully weighed and tested by the rules of language, carry us, His disciples in this far-off century. Why His sacrificed body was to be partaken of does not appear at this point in our investigation, but from the very nature of things it is evident that if there were such a condition or necessity, there was equally a necessity that some equivalent substitute for that body must be found for this partaking. For if it were possible to partake of the crucified body of our

dear Lord, it was certainly impossible to think such a thing. If it were physically possible, it was morally, ethically impossible. That our Lord's meaning was apparent to His disciples is indicated by the fact that no explanation of His words is here recorded. We must therefore place ourselves in their circumstances if we would know the full import of this institution of the Lord's Supper. The *meaning* of our Lord's *words* in instituting the Holy Communion is made evident by an analysis of them through the rules of language; the *reason* for them, for the wonderful results that flow from them, must be sought in the circumstances under which they were spoken. We therefore leave the study of the sentence here, and go back to those circumstances.

The disciples were gathered with our Lord at a celebration of the Jewish Passover. The paschal lamb had been sacrificed, and they were partaking of the same in accordance with the divine command. This partaking was ac-

cepted, looked upon, by them as a necessary, an essential part or adjunct of the paschal sacrifice. At the institution of this sacrifice, centuries before, God had ordered not only that the lamb should be slain and its blood sprinkled upon the lintel and two sideposts of the door of the house, but that the lamb should be eaten by the household. It is specially to be noted also, that the Passover—which was the most solemn sacrifice among the Jews, and which God gave to that nation, not only before the law, but even before the Ten Commandments—was the one essential offering of the Jews, and must be partaken of, if one would avoid the penalty of excommunication.

There must always be some personal act of obedience or faith, in connection with God's saving ordinances, for each individual to appropriate, to make his own, to take for himself the benefits. Those who would be saved must *look upon* the brazen serpent that was lifted up. He who would not thus look, must die even though he were in the very shadow of it, even

though his arms were clasped about it. The ten lepers were commanded to go show themselves unto the priests, but *as they went* they were healed. The paschal lamb was slain on that first awful night, in the midst of the Egyptians, but the destroying angel passed over only the houses in which the lamb had been eaten.

It seems to have been a divinely ordained principle that he who would partake of the benefits of a sacrifice, must, as the doing of an act of faith, partake of the sacrifice itself.

With this practice and obligation, then, of partaking of the lamb sacrificed, the disciples were perfectly familiar. Indeed, when our Lord came to earth, all mankind joined sacrificing and feasting together, heathen nations, as we have said above, having borrowed the practice from the chosen nation. Among the Jews some sacrifices, as the burnt offerings and sin offering, were not accompanied with feasting. But the greater number of their sacrifices were so accompanied. They were, in fact, called in-

discriminately "feast" and "sacrifice," even so that the same Hebrew word signifies "feast" and "sacrifice." Even before the giving of the law, Moses and Aaron, appealing to Pharaoh (Exod. v. 1, 3), use the expressions "holding a feast to God" and "sacrificing to the Lord" as meaning the same thing. It is to be noticed also that Pharaoh's answer shows clearly that he understood perfectly the meaning of the first phrase. His answer was, "Who is the Lord that I should obey His voice? I know not the Lord" (*i.e.*, He is not one of my gods, to whom I make feasts). Jacob offered sacrifices upon the Mount and called his brethren to eat bread, and they did eat bread (Gen. xxxi. 54). "Eating bread" is a phrase used in Scripture for feasting, and thus it is evident that Jacob made a feast to his relatives of the cattle which he had offered in sacrifice. A further explanation of this may be found in Lev. xxi. 6, 17 and 21, where animals slain in sacrifice are called "the bread of God."

But we are brought more clearly face to face

with the prevalence of this method of worship, in the New Testament. Very early the apostles wrote letters to the Antioch disciples (Acts xv. 22-29) that they should abstain from meats offered to idols.\* Again, St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians (I. Cor. x. 18), "Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God, and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." And further on in the

---

\* The writer has very recently talked with a Syrian Christian of the same nation and speaking the same language with our Lord (though the Aramaic has been modified, somewhat modernized, during the centuries of the Christian era), who has frequently seen his Syrian pastor promptly inquire as to gifts of meat sent him by his Mohammedan neighbors, whether they had been offered in sacrifice, and as promptly return them if they had been so offered.



same chapter, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a *feast*, whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake. But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it and for conscience' sake." All this shows that eating of sacrifices, partaking of an altar, was looked upon and was actually practised as a part of the sacrifice itself, as an act of worship addressed to the one true God, or to a false god. It was in fact the appointed way in which men joined with the offerer in making a sacrifice.

All this is enough to show that the disciples, even if they had not been just then engaged in partaking of, in completing, the sacrifice of a Passover, must easily, immediately, have comprehended our Lord's meaning. No further explanation was needed. He had, indeed, for some days been instructing them as to His near coming death, but even if He had not done so, even if He had not added the words "broken for you," His simple command, "Take, eat;

this is My body," could have had no other meaning to them than that His body was to be sacrificed for them, and that the bread was the substitute for, or representative of, the same as, that body, in order that they might partake of the sacrifice.

Thus it appears from a careful study of our Lord's words, observing the absolute rules of language, that our Lord affirmed or predicated His body of the bread in one and only one respect,—as to one quality. Keeping in mind the circumstances under which the words were spoken and the whole sacrificial system of the Jews, it appears that it was not an inherent quality of that body which He thus attributed to the bread. It was the accident, using the term philosophically, the quality, of its being sacrificed. Not as a body, but as a sacrifice, did He predicate His body of the bread. He ascribed nothing human to the bread. It was the quality\* of His body broken, of its being

---

\* The only quality of the paschal lamb that had an essential, a religious, a spiritual value, was its extraneous, not inherent

something sacrificed, of a sacrifice to be eaten, that He thus attributed. In short, our Lord's body was to be sacrificed as a peace offering, a redemption offering.\* It must therefore be

---

yet real, quality or attribute of being an ordained sacrifice. The fact that the sacrifice on the Church's altar, which is the cross on Calvary, was the body of our Lord, does not change the fact that its relation to the partaker resides in its being a sacrifice. Of it as of the paschal lamb, the quality of its being a sacrifice is all that avails in its eating or that in any way brings benefit to the partaker. The quality of being the body of our Lord gives an unprecedented, a unique value, to the sacrifice, makes it a perfect satisfaction for sin. By that value Christians are gainers when they partake of the sacrifice. But still its only relation, and its all-sufficient relation, to them is that of a sacrifice, of an all-sufficient sacrifice.

We are not taught that the purpose of partaking, is that we may partake of the inherent qualities of the body of our Lord, any more than that the Jews might partake of those of the paschal lambs. Indeed, rather, it is because we are not, even by the way as it were, to partake of the inherent qualities of that body, that bread is a substitute for that body sacrificed.

\* It is commonly and rightly held that in our Lord's sacrifice on the cross all the sacrifices were fulfilled which had been hitherto enjoined by God upon His people. But we are considering here not the nature or complete significance of that sacrifice, but the significance of our Lord's command "Take, eat." Plainly the command to partake of it had no reference to it, for instance, as a whole burnt offering, which was not to be partaken of, but to Christ as "our Passover."

eaten. But this was impossible, or was to be avoided, for many reasons, which need not the mentioning. Therefore our Lord, before His Father and before men, made bread equal, equivalent to, the same as (*i.e.*, the representative with full efficacy,\* the representative because it had the same efficacy or force for this purpose), His body in the partaking of the altar on Calvary, in the sacrificial feast that must accompany the sacrifice of His body.

Christ did not command that the bread should be sacrificed. Therefore we are not so to sacrifice it.† Indeed, His declaring the bread to be His body is in its effect a prohibition of our thus sacrificing it. For that body, it may truly be said, is the one thing which we cannot thus

---

\* That our Lord had the right and the power to give this equivalence or efficacy to the bread is practically denied by those who assert that He actually changed the bread into His body. Therefore what seems on the face of it to be a triumphant assertion of divine power is really a denial of it. It is a belittling of Christ's power to declare that in order to convey the benefits of His body by the bread, He actually changed the bread into His body.

† "Sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry" (Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* V., ch. lxxviii., 2).

sacrifice because it has already been sacrificed. It was sacrificed once for all, having been offered for that sacrifice by Christ Himself, who alone could thus offer it. It was not to be sacrificed again. But being thus once sacrificed it remains still to be partaken of. By this partaking, not by our sacrificing, we are joined with Christ in His making the offering for the sacrifice. The sacrificial feast upon, the partaking of, our Lord's sacrificed body was begun by the disciples and brethren immediately on the coming of the Holy Spirit, and has been continued until now, and will be continued through all time. And this is accomplished, this is made possible, through Christ having declared and made bread and wine to be the same as His body and blood for this purpose.

The true Christian altar is the cross on Calvary which bore, through the hours of that awful day, the precious sacrifice of the dear body of our Lord and Saviour. From that one sacrifice went the Church's High Priest, the "High Priest over the house of God," by His own blood

entering in "once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," entering into "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." At that altar was shed "the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot." At that altar was sacrificed "the body of Jesus Christ once," "the one sacrifice of sins forever." At that altar was made "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

The Church has, it is true, always applied sacrificial terms to some of her acts. In her liturgy she bids us pray God to "accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," but in doing this she does not teach us to presume to think of the fruit of our lips as in any way approaching in kind or in degree the sacrificed body of our Lord. In her liturgy, too, she bids her priests say "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee." But in this she is very far

from likening their offering of themselves to Christ's offering of Himself, apart from the gaze of men, in the silence of Gethsemane, when His sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground, and when He made His tremendous, threefold, thrice repeated offering\* in that solemn prayer, "Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me, nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done."

The cross on Calvary is the Church's altar, and all her members must be partakers of that

---

\* It is singular that so little attention has been given to the fact that our Lord's offering was truly made in Gethsemane. It is his agony, not the tremendous significance of His act, that is commonly spoken of. But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, almost in so many words interpreted our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane to be His offering of Himself. What clearer statement could be made of that offering and of its blessed result, than in the words: "Who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though He was a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered, and having been made perfect He became unto all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. v. 7, 8, 9.).

altar. The sacrifice made there must be followed by the sacrificial feast. We *have* an altar\* whereof they have no right to partake who do not acknowledge that Jesus is the Son of God. But it is the right of Christ's disciples from the day the sacrifice was consummated unto this time and until His coming again. Not alone those few faithful ones who were gathered about the cross, when Jesus cried, "It is finished," who yet were to wait forty and ten days before they entered upon the feast, not alone these, but all the faithful through all the ages, may join in the feast. For Christ hath declared that, for this purpose, bread and wine are the authoritative equivalents or representatives of His body and His blood.

We reach therefore this conclusion, that in what is called the instituting of the Lord's Supper, our Lord was establishing no new princi-

---

\* *We have an altar.* That altar either is the cross of Christ on which Christ was immolated for us, or Christ Himself in whom and by whom we offer our prayers.—*St. Thomas Aquinas, Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.*



ple of worship, and made no new institution. He did not change or contravene God's law of worship. His own body was to be sacrificed, and, by God's law, the sacrifice must be partaken of by those who would apply or gain to themselves the benefits thereof. The nature and the conditions and the circumstances of His body, of the sacrifice, forbade its being partaken of even by those immediately present at the sacrifice, still less by all His disciples through all time. Therefore, to enable men to comply with the requirement of God's unchangeable law regarding worship by sacrifices, to meet the difficulties arising from the character of the one great sacrifice, our Lord formally, authoritatively, solemnly, substituted bread and wine for His body, and His blood, made them the same as His body and His blood for the purpose of men's partaking of His sacrifice, gave them the identical purchasing quality, so to speak, which had been given to His body and His blood by its being made "a ransom for all," through sacrifice.

The Lord's Supper differs not, therefore, from other sacrificial feasts in its *significance*. It brings in no new form of worship.

But in its result, its *efficacy*, it is as far above and beyond all other sacrificial feasts, as the crucifixion is above the sacrifice of the paschal lambs. The Lord's Supper stands out far above all other sacrificial feasts because of the pre-eminence of the sacrifice partaken of.

Unlike all sacrifices that preceded it, the sacrifice on the altar of the cross, left no room for any other. It was all-sufficient. It needed not to be repeated. It could not be repeated. It had gained for mankind every possible good, every good which even God Himself could conceive of. The atonement of God and man was completed. All other sacrifices had been made year by year continually and then without taking away sin. But this Man, this August High Priest, this August Victim, having offered Himself, one sacrifice of sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God.

The uncertainty, the continual striving in

continual sacrifices found a peaceful end in the sure and steadfast faith of a perfect sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world.

See, then, how this gracious declaration "Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you," annihilates time and space. *In effect* the hour still is in which the cross is standing on Calvary bearing its sacred sacrifice. They who obey their Lord and Saviour, of all nations and of all times, which have been, which are, and are to be, gather about that self-same cross, joining in the eucharistic participation of that one completed sacrifice. It is a real unity of all the members of Christ's holy Church. It is a real communion of His disciples. In this service all are at one. It is actually and really the same act in which they engage. It is actually the same sacrifice of which they all partake, and each partaking by each disciple goes to the making up of the whole, as the seconds make the century. It is not a partaking of a commemorative sacrifice, or a continued suc-

cession of partakings of commemorative sacrifices which constitutes the Lord's Supper, but that Supper is the continued feast upon the one completed sacrifice, the very body of our Lord. It began at the coming of the Holy Spirit, and will be continued till Christ's coming again, and the sainted dead and the living sinners and those that are yet unborn together are the guests.

In the very hours in which He offered Himself to the Father, the Saviour prayed for His disciples through all time "that they all may be one as we are." In this feast He intended that the whole multitude of His Church, priests and people, should be united in the bond of peace, knit together in a continual league of love. He could not have imposed a higher obligation on them to preserve perfect love and peace together, than by permitting and requiring them all to join, by its participation, in His own sacrifice.

But not only are disciples brought into one communion and fellowship, in the Lord's

Supper, not only is it the very bond of peace among them, it is also the act in which partakers are actually joined with Christ. By this we do not mean that in the Lord's Supper we are joined to His nature. That joining was accomplished long ago, at the Incarnation, when the Son of God took our nature (humanity) upon Him, and became like as we are. His humanity is true humanity. In its nature it differs not from that of all men, and so Christ and all men are sharers of humanity, together constitute humanity. In Christ, by His Incarnation,\* Deity and humanity are united. But in the Lord's Supper, we are united with Christ in His two great personal acts as Offerer of the true Paschal Lamb for an all-availing sacrifice, and as the High Priest pleading that sacrifice.

---

\* To suppose that men partake of Christ's humanity by partaking of His body and blood, is to suppose that His humanity consists only of a body. This is rank heresy. Christ did not take simply a body; He took also a reasonable soul. "Partaking of the body" is not "partaking of the soul." Therefore it is not partaking of humanity.

As has been clearly shown, a partaking of the sacrifice was a partaking of the benefits gained by the sacrifice, united\* the partaker with the offerer. The momentousness of our being thus united with Christ cannot be measured, when we consider the majesty of the Offerer, even Christ Himself, and the greatness as well as the inestimable value, the all-powerful efficacy, of the sacrifice for which He offered Himself. It seems impossible that if, in faithful obedience to Him, we are joined with Him in that great offering, we shall not thereby surely be made partakers of remission of sins and all other benefits of His Passion.

How closely, intimately these great blessings are connected with the eating of the broken bread, Christ's own words well exhibit: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and

---

\* St. Augustine wrote, "To eat bread is the sacrifice of Christians in the New Testament."

I will raise him up at the last day. . . . He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him " (St. John vi. 53, 54, 56).

But we are also united with Christ as the High Priest ever making intercession for us. He not only commanded, "Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you;" He added, also, "this do in remembrance of Me." Therefore He not only permitted and invited men to join with Him in offering His own body for the sacrifice, He also invited them to join in His priestly intercession. For this word "remembrance" means pleading and intercession. It has a causative force. It means "causing to remember," "reminder." Do this in "reminder" of Me. The reminder is addressed to the Father. He is the person to be reminded. And this reminding is the same in character with Christ's intercession. Therefore in eating the broken bread in remembrance (reminder) of Christ, we are actually, by His own provision and permission, joined with Him in that His High Priestly intercession with the Father.

Heaven and earth are one grand Temple of the living God. In heaven, the holy of holies, stands the High Priest of our race, who is also the Head of the race, our Elder Brother, ever making intercession, ever pleading before the Father, His meritorious cross and passion, ever pleading that the redemption of mankind may be applied to each of us. Without the holy of holies, are gathered all the thronging millions of God's worshippers, of the Church militant and the Church in Paradise, united in the holy continued sacrificial feast, which feast will continue until our High Priest shall again come forth, as a triumphant king, His intercessions within being finished, and all the thronging worshippers shall rise with eucharists alone upon their lips, the feast upon the broken bread being ended when the intercession of their High Priest is ended.

But the theory of the sacrificial feast involved not only the unity of the worshippers with each other, and with the maker of the sacrifice, but also with God. The heathen corrupted this



spiritual idea into the notion that their god having received the sacrificed human beings and animals, in return asked the offerer to sit at his table, to partake with him of the meats which had been made his by the sacrifice. The truth is that the eating of a sacrifice signified in respect to God, the partaking of what was His, that is, of His grace, of His blessed influences, of His goodness and power over evil, all those things which the Church, again and again, in her liturgy and prayers sums up as "remission of sins and all other benefits of Christ's passion."

This grace is bestowed by the Holy Ghost, the Vicar of Christ. He is a Spirit and therefore His workings are invisible, hidden, unknown to men except in their results. The spiritual nourishment and growth of man is as secret as the natural growth of a tree or of man himself. All that we do know is that it is the Holy Spirit who worketh that spiritual life within us. He it is that stands, so to speak, at the Lord's table, His hands laden with all

these gifts for them who worship God in Christ's appointed manner. He it is who takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. He it is whose presence here on earth, while the Son of Man is pleading in heaven, animates and vivifies our pleading, and also bestows in return the abundant, overflowing mercies of God. In eating the bread and drinking the wine in obedience to and in accordance with Christ's command, we are joined with the Son and with the Holy Ghost in pleading the sacrifice before the Father, and in return, the Father, through the Holy Spirit, bestows the innumerable blessings which the Son gained for us, and has promised to them who worship God in the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine.

The Church does well then to surround this great worship with eucharists, with thanksgivings. Carefully and lovingly she fashions her thanksgivings into a liturgy, as a setting of pure gold for the choice gem of the Lord's Supper. Let eucharist upon eucharist, thanksgiv-

ing upon thanksgiving, prevent and follow this simple tremendous act, though no liturgy, no words of the Church can add aught to the infinite power given to it by Christ Himself.

“All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption.”

## MEMORANDA.

TWO nouns are frequently joined together by the copula "is."

If one of these nouns is the name of a person or thing, and the other is the name of an immaterial, non-physical thing, having no physical substance, as, for instance, a title, identity may or may not be asserted by such a sentence, and this is determined by its circumstances, or its context.

When two material or physical things, occupying separate spaces and being therefore distinguishable, are thus joined together by the copula "is," complete identity is never asserted, but only the sameness of some one of their qualities or uses.

Our Lord chose this form of expression in order to declare the relation of the bread to His body.

He therefore declared that the bread had some one quality of His body, and He declared no further identity between them.

He, in addition, indicated that this quality given to the bread was that of His body "broken" and "to be eaten."

His body was to be sacrificed, the true Paschal Lamb, and therefore was to be eaten.

Because He gave the bread this same quality, the eating of it has precisely the same force and effect as the eating of His body would have.

The eating of Christ's body would be the eating of that body sacrificed. Such an eating or partaking would be a sacrificial feast.

Sacrificial feasts united the partakers with the one who provided the sacrifice, and so made them sharers in the merits of the sacrifice.

Therefore in the Lord's Supper, they who partake are joined with our Lord in giving Himself, as the true Paschal Lamb, to be sacrificed, and so are made personal sharers in the merits of the sacrifice of the Lamb.











## DATE DUE

[illegible]

HIGHSMITH #45115





Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01030 9229